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1NC

**A.** The concept of “woman” is fluid and undefinable. **Butler 1**:[[1]](#footnote-1)

**“The very subject of women is no longer understood in stable or abiding terms. There is a great deal of material that** not only **questions the viability of “the subject” as the ultimate candidate for representation** or, indeed, liberation, but **[and] there is very little agreement** after all **on what it is that constitutes, or ought to constitute, the category of women.** The domains of political and linguistic “representation” set out in advance the criterion by which subjects themselves are formed, with the result that representation is extended only to what can be acknowledged as a subject. In other words, the qualifications for being a subject must first be met before representation can be extended. ”

The AC fails to recognize “woman” as being fluid and undefinable. The arguments and evidence in the AC attempt to define “woman” by making generalized claims about their private lives and characterizing their emotional and physical response to domestic violence.

**B.** **Turns case**-The AC’s efforts to protect women are undermined by it’s static conception of women. Even if this is ostensibly done to promote the welfare of women, it is precisely this type of representational politics that reinforces patriarchal domination and creates systemic micro-fascism, where women internalize specific views on how they ought to behave based on expectations of proper behavior for women and victims. **Butler 2**:[[2]](#footnote-2)

“Foucault points out that **juridical systems of power produce the subjects they subsequently come to represent. Juridical notions of power appeal to regulate political life in purely negative terms**- that is, through the imitation, prohibition, regulation, control and even “protection” of individuals related to that political structure through the contingent and retractable operation of choice. - that is, through the imitation, prohibition, regulation, control and even “protection” of individuals related to that political structure through the contingent and retractable operation of choice. **But the subjects regulated by such structures are**, by virtue of being subjected to them, **formed, defined, and reproduced in accordance with the requirements of those structures.** If this analysis is right, then **the juridical formation of language and politics that represents women as “the subject” of feminism is itself a distinctive formation and effect of a given version of representational politics. And the feminist subject turns out to be discursively constituted by the very political system that is supposed to facilitate its emancipation. This becomes politically problematic** if that system can be shown to produce gendered subjects along a differential axis of domination or to produce subjects who are presumed to be masculine.[and] In such cases an uncritical appeal to such a system for the emancipation of “women” will be clearly self-defeating.”

This exemplifies itself in the real world. The labeling of women as fitting one static conception makes women who do not fit that description lose out. Waters:[[3]](#footnote-3)

It is unlikely that survivors of lesbian IPV will seek support from shelters because they see shelters as the province of heterosexual women (Helfrich and Simpson 2005). Survivors of lesbian IPV are more likely to consult friends, family or a therapist (Giorgio 2002, Girshick 2002). Domestic violence services are often seen as unavailable or severely limited to survivors whose batterer are female, due to homophobia, social constructions of ―appropriate battered woman and exclusivity. Traditionally, survivors of domestic violence have been heterosexual women mostly with children, who have experienced physical abuse at the hands of their husband or boyfriend. Loseke deemed these women as ―real battered women. Survivors whose circumstances differ or who have different experiences have not been viewed as battered women by shelter advocates (Loseke 1992; Simpson and Helfrich 2005; VanNatta 2005; Helfrich and Simpson 2006). Homophobia Seidman (2003) defines homophobia as a systemic crisis privileging the heteronormative nature of our society by foundationally establish[es]ing that heterosexuality is the assumed social norm to which all other sexualities are compared. While sexuality is seen as a continuum on which heterosexuality and homosexuality are both terminal ends, heterosexuality is hierarchally privileged over homosexuality to such extent that social structures, laws and norms are constructed to value heterosexuality above all others (Bograd 1999). Lesbian battering occurs in the larger context of homophobia which affects women personally, socially and systematically. As Pharr (1986) explains: There is an important difference between the battered lesbian and the battered nonlesbian: the battered non-lesbian experiences violence within the context of a misogynist world: the lesbian experiences violence within the context of a world that is not only woman-hating, but is also homophobic (pg 204). The term homophobia was coined by Weinberg (1972) to describe an irrational fear, hatred and intolerance of homosexuality. This term has evolved and is now viewed as more inline with other ―-isms‖ including racism, sexism and classism (Balsam 2001). Some researchers have proposed that ―heterosexism‖ is a more suitable term. Heterosexism as defined by Herek is ―an ideological system that denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes, any non-heterosexual 14 14 form of behavior, [or] identity, relationship and community‖ (2004: 316). For the purpose of this paper, I use the terms heterosexism and homophobia interchangeably. Whether perceived or actual, homophobia and/or heterosexism [is an] are immense barriers for lesbians seeking assistance for domestic violence. Services that are available to traditional victims of domestic violence are not usually available to lesbians. In a study by Renzetti, 64% of lesbian women in abusive relationships stayed in them simply because they ―did not know where, or how, to seek help (1992: 395). Services readily known and available to heterosexual women are not readily known or available to lesbian women including shelters, hotlines, support groups, transitional housing, court advocates, and child specialists (McLaughlin & Rozee, 2001; Balsam 2001). Shelters and DV services are expected to be anti-heterosexist, anti-homophobic, and concerned solely with domestic violence (Donnelly et al.. 1999). Such expectations come from the community, financial supporters, religious institutions and other shelter residence. This, however, is a dangerous assumption. Society at large privileges heterosexuality over homosexuality as right and moral and lesbians as wrong and immoral. DV workers and shelter residents do not escape these socialized messages and often further isolate and alienate battered lesbians who are seeking shelter from violence in their own homes (Girshick 2002). This alienation can include turning away lesbians because the shelter is ―full‖; not distinguishing the primary aggressor from the survivor in a lesbian relationship and discounting the lesbian survivor‘s experience of abuse as not ―real abuse. All of these place women at risk.

C. The alternative is a refusal to live a single identity as the truth and instead recognize that the category of women is permanently open to different interpretations. Only then can we solve for representational politics. Vasterling:[[4]](#footnote-4)

Feminist politics can draw a valuable lesson from the general argument concerning radical inclusivity. In so far as feminist politics invokes the category of "women," it seems to face a dilemma. On the one hand, it cannot but rely on this category if it is to have a basis for solidarity and empowerment. On the other hand, not even the most politically correct, multiculturalist specification of identities can fulfill the promise of inclusivity this category holds out. On the contrary, if anything, politically correct identity politics evokes rather than assuages recriminations of exclusion and lack of recognition. Instead of empowerment and solidarity, a "politicing of identity" (Butler 1993, 117) is the result. We are confronted with the dilemma of either giving up the category of "women" and hence the basis of feminist politics or resigning ourselves to proto-totalitarian identity politics. However, if we take the category of "woman" as a regulative idea(l) rather than an actual representation of all women, the dilemma is resolved. This means that we have "to learn a double movement: to invoke the category and, hence, provisionally to institute an identity and at the same time to open the category as a site of permanent political contest" (Butler 1993, 222). Only if we do not forget that the idea of total inclusivity is not realizable as such and hence that the category of "women" is permanently open to different interpretations, can the invocation of this category enable solidarity and empower feminist politics.

**D.** The role of your ballot is to reject the proliferation of harmful mindsets. It's the only real impact that occurs at the end of the debate round, our attempts to find capital T Truth in a 45-minute debate are unrealistic. After signing your ballot, the resolution doesn't magically become true or false, but you CAN reject the type of mindset endorsed by the affirmative case by refusing to vote affirmative and spark a change in thinking that has real implications for our world. Your obligation as a judge begins and ends at the tournament, but you have a responsibility to this activity as a participant and to humanity as a member that extend beyond the confines of this room. Moreover, our mindset in framing social issues, conscious or not, shapes our ability to effectively solve the problems we discuss in the real world. Blum:[[5]](#footnote-5)

Mindset is the underlying beliefs and assumptions we bring to a situation, conscious or unconscious. It is our inner dialogue reflecting our view of reality, and it shapes how we interpret situations, how we act, and how we are acted upon. For instance, when you enter a dialogue with a creative mindset, you look to advance and build on the discussion at hand. On the other hand, if you approach a conversation with a critical mindset, you believe your value-add is to point out flaws and missing elements. Both creative and critical mindsets are essential in business, but when people’s mindsets are inconsistent with the needs and goals of the situation, problems occur—often in the form of unproductive or counterproductive action. Skills training will not lead to sustained behavior change unless you address underlying mindsets in parallel. For example, people can be trained in innovation practices—tools to advance creativity, such as the “plussing” Pixar is known for (Sims. Peter, Little Bets: How Breakthrough Ideas Emerge from Small Discoveries, New York: Free Press, 2011)—but those skills will never be effectively applied by someone with an unconsciously skeptical mindset. Skepticism will surface as negative languageand lead to a focus on flaws. Similarly, someone with rigorous quality management training operating from a creative mindsetmight tend to focus on what is working or look for opportunities to innovate but fail to identify and address flaws, breakdowns, or substandard outcomes. Managing and Changing Mindset Through Responsible Inquiry As success largely depends on ensuring the mindset people bring is appropriate to the situation, the first step in managingand changingmindset is creating awareness. When people are unaware of their own mindset, they remain in a reactive pattern driven by unconscious beliefs and assumptions. Though they may believe they’re trying to do things differently, they often experience repeated failures in the same activities because their actions are shaped continually by the same unconscious, unproductive mindsets. In working with a senior leader at a large technology company (let’s call him Bill), I observed this dynamic in play and helped him apply a simple strategy to get control of and manage his mindset. Bill operated predominantly from a fear-based mindset with the underlying belief that he was “at risk.” Regardless of the situation, his immediate orientation was to look at the places where he was likely to be held unfairly accountable, or to the places where the opinion of others might negatively affect him. With that unconscious predisposition, nearly every action he took had some measure of defensiveness in it. No matter how much Bill tried to reshape his actions, they were unconsciously driven by a mindset of fear. This changed as we began to note and question his fear-based assumptions through a process called “Responsible Inquiry.” When he would say something such as, “If I blow this, I am gone,” we agreed to pause, call it out as an assumption, and note the mindset behind it. With just a bit of dialogue he was able to see that his general fear of failure often was applied inappropriately to situations that, in reality, entailed little risk. We took this a step further and examined the actionsthat arose from his assumptions, and saw that as soon as Bill believed his mistake would get him fired, he immediately took a set of defensive and largely unproductive actions. Ironically, he began to see that those defensive actions were more likely to lead to him being fired than courageous actions he might have taken if he weren’t being driven by fear. Through this simple process, Bill saw the connection between his mindset and actions. More importantly, he began to understand that his results were less a function of his actions than of his underlying thinking, and he was able to break the cycle of unconscious reactivity and make choices more consistent with his true intent. The entire process of mindset management is based on three premises: My mindset drives my actions. I am in control of my mindsets. To take different actions and produce different results, I must own and manage my mindsets. Until a leader accepts his/her own “responsibility” in all of this, mindsets and their subsequent actions are something that will remain “outside of the leader.” Much of the work in mindset management focuses on developing awareness, followed by a responsible mindset driven by the underlying belief: “I am an integral factor in everything that occurs and can influence every situation through my thinking, actions, and reactions.” Defining and managing mindset, along with developing a responsible mindset, offers leaders the key to fundamental change and previously unachievable results. Without these distinctions and practices, however, mindset joins the multitude of esoteric buzzwords that are thrown around without clear definition.

Finally, your role as an educator mandates that you reject representation frames that justify violence and oppression. **Gill**:[[6]](#footnote-6)

Too many intellectuals subscribe to or create orthodoxy that simply reinforces dominant power-knowledge structures. Others simply ignore fundamental problems of authority and violence and, as such, indirectly subordinate themselves to dominant power. By contrast, this chapter has been written from the viewpoint of a critical theory that seeks to develop a new transnational historical materialist approach. So, from a critical perspective, what is the role and duty of critical intellectuals? First, they must provide a clear and realistic analysis of the nature and logic of contemporary developments. Second, they must speak out critically on the basis of their freedom to demand respect for questions of justice. Third, they must oppose all patterns of domination that destroy the creative human spirit. And finally, they must find ways to develop new critical perspectives. And at a time of social crisis, where social and political thought seems to be at an impasse as it stands transfixed before the dilemmas of globalization, intellectuals need to use their creative imagination. They need to help us to rethink the potentials in society that allow for creativity and greater human possibility.

\*\*FRONTLINES\*\*

AT-PERM

1. No permutation- Solvency requires divergence from the current domestic violence movement/conception. Giordano:[[7]](#footnote-7)

These suggestions support efforts that diverge from those of the dominant heterosexual domestic violence movement. If the domestic violence movement refuses to respond to the existence and severity of abuse in queer relationships, those who study and experience abuse in queer relationships must find ways to create new systems designed to support the communities in which it occurs. These suggestions direct advocates toward the formation of new collectives of people who realize that the systems in place, though once progressive and impactful, no longer work (Stark 2007). Many of these suggestions mirror those of previous researchers and may be critiqued for being reactive. We may effectively prevent future abuse, though, by first reacting to existing abuse. For example, holding batterers accountable may help prevent them from abusing future partners, thus, decreasing the prevalence of IPV. This work supports the existence of many movements working toward a common goal, as it acknowledges there are many different experiences with IPV. In order to bring an end to intimate partner violence, intervention efforts must be directed toward all those involved, effectively all members of society. Stark (2007) points out that an end to IPV has not been achieved, because the domestic violence movement has failed to address the inequalities at the core of intimate relationships. I add that under the system in place survivors who do not fit the dominant model are left without resources or support and abusers are permitted to continue with their behaviors as reasons society is no closer to seeing an end to intimate partner violence.

2. No double bind: They misunderstand my argument. Butler 1 isolates that the AC links based on how they frame the category of women. It’s not a one-time link that can be overcome by an alternative because they literally frame the issue directly opposite from what the alternative advocates we do. This means you can accept the part of the double bind that says the alt can overcome the small instance of representational politics because it’s not a small harm—it’s a major one.

3. No double bind: They’re non-responsive to my evidence. Butler 2 indicates that any harm to representational politics doesn’t represent just a single instance of harm—it’s literally an attempt to get back inside the systems of power again. This means you can accept the part of the double bind that says the alt can overcome the small instance of representational politics because it’s not a small harm—the aff literally embodies structures of power.

AT-NO REAL WORLD IMPACT

This exemplifies itself in the real world. The labeling of women as fitting one “true” image makes those who don’t fit the true image of victim lose out. **Leisenring**:[[8]](#footnote-8)

Because victim assignments are always open-ended, they may be sites of contestation and negotiation. As Holstein and Miller (1997:37) state, “Disagreements about assignments of victim status may become conﬂicts in which the assignments are openly disputed. Both injury and responsibility may be at stake in such disputes.” Battered women who fail to show that they are “true” victims risk losing access to services offered by the criminal justice system, shelters, and other social service organizations (Dunn 2001; Loseke 1992). However, because mainstream victim discourses have often constructed the victim in problematic ways, battered women who are labeled “true” victims may also incur unwanted costs.

AT-THEORY PREFIAT AND POSTFIAT BAD

1. This argument is absurd—neg runs post fiat and topicality all the time with no abuse—same logic applies to post fiat and discourse—checks all their abuse.

2. Terminal defense—they can go all in on link turning discourse and win off it since it comes first. Solves any abuse since they only have to deal with one layer—stop whining.

3. Counterinterp-Neg can run post-fiat and pre-fiat impacts. Reasons to Prefer:

Ground-Neg needs to be able to challenge discourse of the aff—that’s the role of the ballot section. This means I also need access to post fiat turns because otherwise aff can go all in for terminal defense on the K and win off uncontested AC offense. This kills fairness because I have to win terminal defense on the AC to win the round if the K debate is a wash.
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